



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/345,668	06/30/1999	JOHN S. DANIEL	36968-179673	1489

7590 07/31/2006
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LEVITAN, DMITRY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/345,668

Applicant(s)

DANIEL ET AL.

Examiner

Dmitry Levitan

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,7 and 9-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Amendment, filed 07/14/06, has been entered. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-18 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. In light of Applicant's amendment, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-17 under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112, has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Emery (US 6,011,975).

2. Regarding claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-12, 14 and 16-18, Emery teaches a method and a telecom system (Fig. 2) including a wireless system with a mobile switching center (Cellular MC 22 on Fig. 2) and including a wireline network (telephones connected to SSP 11 on Fig. 2 and 11:2-12), wherein wireline units may call each other by using an extension (wired and wireless members of a Centrex group 24:55-64).

The wireline network has a communication element (Integrated Service Control Point ISCP 40 and Signaling Transfer Point STP 31 on Fig. 2, 12:11-13 and 13:17-22) with access to a table with wireline entries (stored data table 25:38-47 with data fields, inherently including routing and destination numbers 13:31-44, because correlation of routing numbers and destination numbers is essential for the system operation) including wireline extension (TCAP routing number) and corresponding wireline directory number (TCAP destination number). Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) is a protocol utilizing numerous tables including the table with routing and destination numbers entries.

Art Unit: 2616

The telecom system includes wireline and wireless units (Fig. 2) where each unit can call the other using an extension (Centrex Group 24:55-64).

The wireless system comprises:

A. the table with entries for all wireless units (wireless members of the Centrex group 24:55-64), inherently stored in one of communication element/ISCP databases (13:49-62), because storing a number corresponding to an extension is essential for the system operation,

B. the communication element (ISCP 40 and STP 31 on Fig. 2, 12:11-13) comprises the table (TCAP) and receive routing information data from a service control point to route the call according to the corresponding wireless number based on the instructions received (inherently part of the system, because Emery teaches user registration with the table of ISCP 40 (16:1-27), wherein user provides the data for routing future phone calls, including wireless and wireline. The communication element comprises the storage portion of ISCP with the table, which receives the data from an STP 31 12:20-25, wherein STP 31 operates as a service control point),

C. the MSC of the wireless network (Cellular MC 26 on Fig. 2) being connected to the communication element (ISCP 40 and STP 31 on Fig. 2) and being operative to access table (TCAP) and route calls (MSC operation is essential to the system, wherein wireless and wireline units are included in the same Centrex Group 24:51-64).

The telecom system is a Centrex network where a caller would dial a limited number of digits and the network would access data in the ISCP to determine the complete destination number (24:55-64).

Emery does not teach storing the table at MSC and the communication element comprising the MSC.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the communication element with the MSC in the system of Emery to improve the system connection setup time for the wireless customers if the majority of the Centrex Group are wireless.

In addition, regarding claim 9, Emery teaches qualified wireless and wireline units as the subscribers of a Centrex Group (24:51-64).

In addition, regarding claim 17, Emery teaches communication element not storing the table, comprising instructions to route a call to the corresponding wireless number (switches SSP 11, 13 etc on Fig. 2 and 11:22-30 routing telephone calls with ISCP instructions 16:55-65 to reach a wireless member of the Centrex Group 24:55-64).

In addition, regarding claim 18, Emery teaches providing centrex service to wireless customers 10:50-67, wherein the objection of the Emery system is to provide the same services to land based and wireless customers 7:53-61, therefore the centrex service between the wireless customers, as claimed in 18 is achieved in the Emery system by utilizing the same table and the same operation, as described above (see claim 1 rejection).

3. Regarding claims 13 and 15, Emery teaches a method and a telecom system (Fig. 2) including a wireless system with a mobile switching center (Cellular MC 22 on Fig. 2), PBX services (10:57-67) and including a wireline network (telephones connected to SSP 11 on Fig. 2 and 11:2-12), wherein wireline units may call each other by using an extension (wired and wireless members of a Centrex group 24:55-64).

The wireline network has a communication element (Integrated Service Control Point ISCP 40 and Signaling Transfer Point STP 31 on Fig. 2, 12:11-13 and 13:17-22) with access to a table

Art Unit: 2616

with wireline entries (stored data table 25:38-47 with data fields, inherently including routing and destination numbers 13:31-44, because correlation of routing numbers and destination numbers is essential for the system operation) including wireline extension (TCAP routing number) and corresponding wireline directory number (TCAP destination number). Transaction Capabilities Application Part (TCAP) is a protocol utilizing numerous tables including the table with routing and destination numbers entries.

The telecom system includes wireline and wireless units (Fig. 2) where each unit can call the other using an extension (Centrex Group 24:55-64).

The wireless system comprises:

A. the table with entries for all wireless units (wireless members of the Centrex group 24:55-64), inherently stored in one of communication element/ISCP databases (13:49-62), because storing a number corresponding to an extension is essential for the system operation,

B. the communication element (ISCP 40 and STP 31 on Fig. 2, 12:11-13) comprises the table (TCAP) and being operative to route the call,

C. the MSC of the wireless network (Cellular MC 26 on Fig. 2) being connected to the communication element (ISCP 40 and STP 31 on Fig. 2) and being operative to access table (TCAP) and route calls (MSC operation is essential to the system, wherein wireless and wireline units are included in the same Centrex Group 24:51-64).

The telecom system is a Centrex network where a caller would dial a limited number of digits and the network would access data in the ISCP to determine the complete destination number (24:55-64).

Emery does not teach storing the table in a distributed scheme at each end office, PBX and MSC.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store the table in a distributed scheme at each end office, PBX and MSC in the system of Emery to improve the system connection setup time for all customers and the system reliability, because the distributed scheme will reduce the setup time by faster extension to destination number conversion and a failure of one of the tables will not fail all the Centrex Group.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/06 and directed to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 12 of the Response, Applicant argues that the ISCP of Emery cannot route calls but only formulate response messages.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Emery teaches ISCP to accept a query identifying the caller and the destination of the call, examine the customer service graph and redirect/route the call according to the service graph data to an announcement, voice mail, other phone number, etc 20:45-21:52.

On page 12 of the Response, Applicant argues that the ISCP of Emery is a SCP of claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Emery teaches signaling transfer points STP, shown on Fig. 1 and 2, which are equivalent to the SCP of claim 1 (see claim 1 rejection above).

On page 13 of the Response, Applicant argues that Emery teaching of ISCP and STP separate from MSC (Mobile Switching Center) teaches away from combining these elements. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Emery teaches wireless registers (HLR, VLR and EIR), incorporated into ISCP 9:13-18 to be located at the MSC or at a remote point 5:1-8.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combines the communication element with the MSC in the system of Emery to improve the system connection setup time for the wireless customers if the majority of the Centrex Group are wireless. See Obvious Design Choice Case on making elements integral In re Larson 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965).

In addition, the best mode of Emery does not exclude modifying the system of Emery for a particular environment as disclosed above.

On pages 13 and 14 of the Response, Applicant argues that ISCP and STP cannot be combined with MSC because the MSC would not store and access the table.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner believes that combining ISCP and STP with an MSC will not change the operation of the system, as storing the table in the ISCP element of the MSC and will reduce the delay time for wireless customers call setup.

On page 14 of the Response, Applicant argues that MSC is a switch for mobile users and ISCP is a remote database within SS7 and therefore cannot be combined.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

ISCP, also known as a central controller 9:5-25, is not a remote device, but a controller related to a mobile switching controller (MSC) to service a wireless customer in his home region 9:15-17 and therefore can be combined with an MSC, as disclosed in the rejection of the claims above.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dmitry Levitan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3093. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 4:30.

Art Unit: 2616

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doris To can be reached on (571) 272-7529. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Handwritten signature of Dmitry Levitan, consisting of stylized initials 'DL' followed by a full signature.

Dmitry Levitan
Examiner
Art Unit 2616